

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE  
12 COMMISSION,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 LOUIS V. SCHOOLER and FIRST  
16 FINANCIAL PLANNING  
17 CORPORATION d/b/a WESTERN  
18 FINANCIAL PLANNING  
19 CORPORATION,

20 Defendants.

Case No.: 3:12-CV-02164-GPC-JMA

**ORDER APPROVING:**

**SALE OF LAS VEGAS 2 PROPERTY  
AND AUTHORITY TO PAY  
BROKER'S COMMISSION**

**[ECF No. 1616]**

21 Before the Court is the Receiver's Motion for Approval of Sale of the Las Vegas 2  
22 Property and Authority to Pay Broker's Commission. ECF No. 1616. No opposition was  
23 filed. The Securities and Exchange Commission filed a notice of non-opposition to the  
24 motion on June 28, 2018. ECF No. 1628. Based upon a review of the moving papers and  
25 the applicable law, the Court **GRANTS** the Receiver's motion.

**BACKGROUND**

**A. The SEC Enforcement Action**

26 On January 21, 2016, the Court granted the SEC's motion for final judgment  
27 against Defendant Louis V. Schooler. ECF No. 1170. The SEC had initiated this civil  
28

1 action against Defendant Schooler and Western Financial Planning Corporation  
2 (“Western”) four years earlier, on account of their practice of defrauding investors into  
3 purchasing unregistered securities. *Id.* (citing Second Summary Judgment Order, ECF  
4 No. 1081). To carry out the scheme, Defendant Western bought undeveloped real estate,  
5 with cash or through financing, and simultaneously formed one or more General  
6 Partnerships (“GPs”) to own the land. First Summary Judgment Order, ECF No. 1074 at  
7 10. Western then sold General Partnership units to investors and sold the undeveloped  
8 real estate to the General Partnerships. *Id.* at 10. In total, Western raised approximately  
9 \$153 million from almost 3,400 investors through implementing this scheme. *Id.*

#### 10 **B. The Decline of the General Partnership Assets**

11 In 2013, the Court-appointed Receiver, Thomas Hebrank, engaged licensed  
12 appraisers to value the 23 properties owned by the General Partnerships. ECF No. 203 at  
13 2. Those professionals determined that the land was worth \$16,328,000 and that the net  
14 appraised value (appraised value less outstanding balances on all mortgages) of the  
15 properties was \$12,860,661. *Id.* The net appraised value represented just 8.41% of the  
16 total funds that the general partners had invested in the land. *Id.* The Receiver further  
17 estimated that, based on the then-current appraised values of the land, the average GP  
18 investor would suffer an 88.40% loss if the GP properties were sold in 2013. *Id.*

19 Three years later, soon after final judgment was entered, the Receiver moved for  
20 authority to conduct an Orderly Sale of the General Partnership Properties (“Orderly  
21 Sale”). Motion for Orderly Sale, ECF No. 1181-1. In the Motion, the Receiver indicated  
22 that the aggregate value in the GP accounts had been steadily decreasing while litigation  
23 was ongoing. *See id.* In September 2012, the Receivership had assets of \$6.6 million.  
24 *Id.* at 1. By the end of 2015, the assets had dropped to \$3.5 million, and the Receiver had  
25 reason to believe that the value of the Receivership would continue to drastically  
26  
27  
28

1 decrease through the end of 2016.<sup>1</sup> This decline, he noted, was due to three main factors:  
2 (1) 14 of the 23 properties were not appreciating in value<sup>2</sup>; (2) the properties were not  
3 worth enough to cover the costs of the GPs carrying the properties; and (3) low levels of  
4 investor contributions to pay GP administrator fees, tax preparation fees, property taxes,  
5 property insurance premiums, and notes owed to Western. *See id.* at 1-2. In other words,  
6 the Receiver concluded, because the money being spent to hold the GP properties was  
7 disproportionately high in relation to the value of the GP's real estate assets, the  
8 Receivership was in a steady decline. *Id.*

9 In order to prevent the value of the Receivership from falling into further decline,  
10 the Receiver proposed that the GP properties be sold in accordance with Court-approved  
11 orderly sale procedures. *Id.* The Receiver's proposal explained that the best way to  
12 maximize the value of all of the GP assets for the benefit of all investors, irrespective of  
13 any given investors' direct property interest, was to initiate an orderly sale of the GP  
14 properties. *Id.* The Receiver estimated that the Receivership, after conducting sales of  
15 the GP properties, Western's properties and asset recovery, would be worth \$21,804,826.  
16 *Id.* at 16.

### 17 **C. The Receiver's Motion for Orderly Sale**

18 On May 20, 2016, the Court held a hearing on the Receiver's Motion for Orderly  
19 Sale, at which time the Court heard from the SEC, Defendant, the Receiver, and the  
20 investor-intervenors — that is, those investors who were granted permission under Rule  
21 23 to intervene to oppose the Receiver's Motion. *See* ECF No. 1298. A short time  
22 thereafter, on May 25, 2016, the Court approved, in part, the Receiver's Orderly Sale  
23

---

24  
25  
26 <sup>1</sup> The Receiver provided the Court with projections that the Receivership would further decline to \$1.8  
27 million by the end of 2016. Indeed, the Receiver's projection has since proved to be accurate. The Twentieth  
28 Interim Status Report submitted by the Receiver indicates that the Receivership's current cash and cash  
equivalent balance is \$666,113. ECF No. 1505 at 17.

<sup>2</sup> By way of example, the Receiver notes that the value of these 14 properties in 2016, \$3,732,815, was about  
\$400,000 less than their value in 2013, \$4,137,000. *Id.* at 2.

1 process.<sup>3</sup> ECF No. 1304.

2 In approving the Orderly Sale, the Court addressed and evaluated the concerns  
3 expressed by the Receiver, the SEC, and myriad investors, all of whom held differing  
4 positions on whether the Orderly Sale would benefit the Receivership estate. *See*  
5 *generally* ECF Nos. 1181 (Motion for Orderly Sale), 1232 (SEC Response), 1234 (Dillon  
6 Investors' Response), 1235 (Graham Investors' Response); *see also, e.g.*, ECF Nos. 1240,  
7 1242, 1244, 1249-1257 (Letters from Investors). The Court also took into consideration  
8 the recommendations of the investors' experts, as set forth in the Xpera Report. *See* ECF  
9 No. 1304 at 16. The Xpera Report, the Court noted, substantially agreed with the  
10 Receiver on how to maximize the value of the Receivership estate and, for the most part,  
11 agreed on the appraised value of the various GP properties. *Id.* As such, the Court  
12 directed the Receiver, where feasible, to incorporate the recommendations of the Xpera  
13 Report into his ultimate Orderly Sale proposal. *Id.* at 19.

14 On July 22, 2016, the Receiver moved for permission to engage CBRE, a real  
15 estate brokerage firm, as a consultant in order to weigh the pros and the cons of the Xpera  
16 Report. ECF No. 1341-1. The Court granted the Receiver's motion on August 30, 2016.  
17 ECF No. 1359. CBRE presented its findings on the GP properties on October 24, 2016.  
18 ECF No. 1419 (filed under seal). On November 22, 2016, the Receiver submitted a  
19 report evaluating the Xpera Report recommendations. ECF No. 1405. The Court  
20 reviewed the Receiver's report and adopted the recommendations contained therein on  
21 December 12, 2016. ECF No. 1423.

#### 22 **D. Las Vegas 2 Property**

23 The Las Vegas 2 Property (the "Property") is approximately 4.62 acres of  
24 undeveloped land in Clark County, Nevada. ECF No. 1616-1 at 2. The Property was  
25

---

26  
27 <sup>3</sup> The Court directed the Receiver to file a Modified Orderly Sale Process that incorporated the public sale  
28 process consistent with the requirement of 28 U.S.C. § 2001. ECF No. 1304. The Receiver filed a modified  
proposal on June 8, 2016 (ECF No. 1309) and the Court approved the modified proposal on August 30, 2016  
(ECF No. 1359).

1 held outright by Horizon Partners and Rainbow Partners, but has since been transferred to  
2 the Qualified Settlement Fund Trust. *Id.*

3 In 2013, the Receiver obtained an appraisal of the Property estimating the value to  
4 be \$945,000. *Id.* at 2. In 2015, the Receiver obtained a broker opinion of value for the  
5 Property, which was estimated at \$1,375,000. *Id.* In 2016, Xpera Group valued the  
6 Property between \$1,600,000 and \$2,000,000. *Id.* With the Court’s approval, the  
7 Receiver listed and marketed the Property in May 2016. *Id.*

8 The Receiver initially received an all-cash offer for \$1,610,000. *Id.* at 3. After  
9 additional offers were received, however, bidding ensued. *Id.* KB Home NV Acquisition  
10 LLC gave the highest and best offer of \$1,725,000, which the Receiver accepted. *Id.* In  
11 accordance with the Court-approved modified Orderly Sale procedures, *see generally*  
12 ECF No. 1309, 1359, the Receiver sent notice of the offer to investors. ECF No. 1616-1  
13 at 3. The Receiver and Buyer executed a Purchase and Sale Agreement and Joint Escrow  
14 Instructions, which is subject to a qualified overbid and this Court’s approval. *Id.* Buyer  
15 removed all contingencies—besides Court approval—on May 24, 2018. *Id.* On July 2,  
16 2018, the Receiver notified the Court that no qualified overbids had been received for the  
17 Property. ECF No. 1631.


### 18 **E. Conclusion**

19 The Court finds that the purchase price of \$1,725,000 is reasonable in light of the  
20 fact that it is much higher than the 2015 broker opinion of value and within Xpera  
21 Group’s 2016 valuation range. The Court is also satisfied that the Receiver has complied  
22 with the modified Orderly Sale procedures. The Receiver’s notice of the sale adhered to  
23 the modified Orderly Sale procedures—which require that notice of the sale be published  
24 “in the county, state, or judicial district of the United States *wherein the realty is*  
25 *situated*,” 28 U.S.C. § 2002 (emphasis added)—by publishing notice in the Las Vegas  
26 Review-Journal and by providing notice to the investors. Accordingly, and given that no  
27 opposition to the present Motion has been filed or raised, and no qualified overbid was  
28 received, the Court **GRANTS** Receiver’s motion for approval of sale.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

1. The Motion is granted;
2. The sale of the Property known as the Las Vegas 2 Property, as described on Exhibit A to the Declaration of Thomas C. Hebrank in support of the Motion, by Thomas C. Hebrank to KB Home NV Acquisition LLC, is confirmed and approved;
3. The purchase price of \$1,725,000 for the Las Vegas 2 Property is confirmed and approved;
4. The Receiver is immediately authorized to complete the sale transaction, including executing any and all documents as may be necessary and appropriate to do so; and
5. Because a broker is representing the buyer, and pursuant to the Court-approved listing agreement, a commission in the amount of 6% of the final purchase price is approved.

Dated: July 30, 2018

  
Hon. Gonzalo P. Curiel  
United States District Judge